

the type of the Linnean genus *Cimex*. To this I replied, in the same journal (March 17th, p. 464), that the type of the Linnean *Cimex* could never be *lectularius*, as (1) Linnaeus stated no types; (2) *lectularius* does not agree with the diagnosis of *Cimex*; and (3) another type for the latter genus was duly selected by Fabricius later on. Blanford replied on the same and following pages, stating that types of certain genera were fixed by Linné. As the information was, in part, new to me and several of my correspondents, I abstract it now. It would have been answered long ago had I not had a very bad accident while horse-riding, rendering me a cripple for over eight months (with the prospect of several more), and necessitating operations under chloroform (one more in a few days).* Under these circumstances all my work has been greatly retarded, and I was unable to visit the only house in which 'Nature' was to be found (*then*) in Honolulu.

The "rules of Linnaeus" were, according to Blanford, printed in his 'Philosophia Botanica,' a work not accessible to me now. Of these, Nos. 242 and 246 are quoted by Blanford:—

"242. *Nomen genericum Antiquum antiquo generi convenit.*

"246. *Si genus receptum, secundum jus naturæ et artis in plura dirimi debet, tum nomen antea commune manebit vulgatissimæ et officinali plantæ.*"

There are several comments to be made on this:—

(1) The 1758 edition of the 'Systema Naturæ' is universally regarded as the foundation of entomological nomenclature, and there is nothing there of such rules, nor is there any mention, in the Introduction, of the 'Philosophia Botanica.'

(2) Even admitting these rules for Vertebrata, it is well known that many of the insects known to the ancients are incorrectly identified at the present day. Linné himself fell, apparently, into gross error; for example, Chermes, Ichneumon (not an insect), Empis, Tipula, Aphis, &c.; and, personally, I would be very sorry to attempt to affix the types of any Linnean genera by those "rules."

There are, I believe, only two generic names which can be settled in this manner, viz. *Apis* (*mellifera*) and *Cimex*; but here another (and, as I believe, superior) factor comes into play—*lectularius* cannot be the type, because it is antagonistic to the generic diagnosis.

It is curious that not one, so far as I can trace, of Linné's entomological pupils paid any attention to this (impossible) rule of "commonest species," and that the best known, *i. e.* Fabricius, deliberately fixed on *bidens* as the type of *Cimex*.

As to *Clinocoris*, 1829, which I restored in place of *Klino-philos*, I am aware that the "substitution of one name for

[* The present article was received on January 9th, 1905.—ED.]

another on the score of convenience is absolutely in defiance of the 'rule of priority,' but when the earlier name is found to have been wrongly accepted up to the present, it is, I think, obvious that such a substitution is not only convenient, but obligatory.

3. It may be noted, with reference to recent discussions, that Sherborn ('Index Animalium,' 1902) accepts Geoffroy's 1762 genera.

Fam. COCCIDÆ.

1. Fernald Cat., p. 54. *Lecaniodiaspis*; the original spelling of this was *Lecanodiaspis*, and the type is *sardoa*, not *dendrobii*, as stated.

2. A species omitted in Fernald Cat. (apparently) is *Coccus pruni*, Burmeister (May 28th, 1849), in *Zeit. für Zoologie*, p. 177, on *Prunus domestica*, Germany.

The diagnosis is as follows:—

"♂ viridi-griseus, albo farinosus, alis albidis; scutello parvo, binodoso; antennis pubescentibus, pedibus nudis gracilibus; abdominis segmento penultimo et antepenultimo bisetoso. Long. $\frac{2}{3}$ lin.

"♀ elliptica, viridigrisea, albo farinosa, capite magno in prothoracem postice producto; abdominis lateribus paululam depressis, segmentis duobus ultimis utrinque pilosis. Long. 1 lin."

This is followed by a long description in German.

3. The references to many of the Zehntnerian species are incorrect, being taken from separately paged reprints. At the present moment I can supply a correct reference only to the following:—

Aspidiotus sacchari caulis, Zehntner (July 15th, 1897), 'Archief voor de Java-Suikerindustrie,' v. p. 735-44, pl. viii.

Fam. CIMICIDÆ.

In the 'Entomologist' (August, 1903, p. 215), I stated that I had not seen the description of *Philia*, Schiödte. I have now been able to secure Kröyer's 'Naturhistorisk Tidskrift,' Bind iv. (1842-3), and find that *Philia* is not a valid genus. In the 'Revisio critica specierum generis Tetyrae Fabricii, quarum exstant in Museo Regio Hafniensi exempla typica' (pp. 279-312), "*Philia m.*" is simply placed at the head of the descriptions of several species below the Fabrician nomenclature. On p. 281, Schiödte states that *Calliphara* and *Callidea* (sic) are preoccupied by *Calliphora*, Macquart, 1835, and *Calleida*, Dejean, Latr., 1829, and that they form only one genus. On pp. 315-60 are the "Forhandlingler i det skandinaviske entomologiske Selskab," in which (on pp. 346-8) Schiödte discusses his own paper, and definitely states that *Philia* is proposed as a new name for the above mentioned genera. As neither *Calliphara* nor *Calidea* is

preoccupied, and as they form good genera, *Philia* cannot stand, and for "*Philia*, Stål nec Schiödte," I propose "*Schioedtia*, n.n., type *senator* (Fabr.)."

2. To the same entry in the 'Entomologist' (1903, p. 215) add:—

SCHIÖDTE, 1842-3, Naturh. Tidskr. iv. p. 330. (δ) *Cephaloctenus*, unnecessary "emendation" for *Cephalocteus*, Dufour, 1834.

3. The reference to *Legnotus*, Lethierry and Severin (Cat. i. p. 78), is Kröyer's Naturh. Tidskr. (2), ii. p. 464.

Fam. NAUCORIDÆ (?).

1. Sherborn ('Index Animalium,' 1902, p. 647) cites a hemipterous genus, *Naucorinus*, Meuschen, 1778, Mus. Gronov. p. 69, with apparently (see p. 1146) no species mentioned. I have not seen the work recently, but believe the form is only used in the plural, and is rather of a tribal or sectional value. I would be grateful for any information.

ERRATA (ENTOM. xxx.).

"BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND NOMENCLATORIAL NOTES ON THE HEMIPTERA.—No. 3."

Page 280, Fam. Pyrrhocoridae, delete "*Probergrothius*," n.n., for *Odontopus*. The latter is apparently not validly preoccupied.

Page 281, line 18, for "*techii*" read *t. echii*; line 23, for "1903" read 1803; lines 24 and 26, delete *Macrothyreus* and *Macrocephalus*; line 6 from bottom, for *Dakulosphaira* read *Daktulosphaira*; line 3 from bottom, for *Embolophora* read *Embolophpora*; line 2 from bottom, for *Gonionotus* read *Gonia-notus*; transpose marks to footnotes.

Page 282. The footnote refers to the spelling of *Phlæophthiridium* and *Rhizophthiridium*.

LEPIDOPTERA OF THE LINCOLNSHIRE COAST.

BY A. E. GIBBS, F.L.S.

I HAD the good fortune to spend the month of July, 1904, at Theddlethorpe St. Helen, a little-frequented spot on the Lincolnshire coast. Our bungalow was situated on the top of the sandhills, which are of considerable height, and have been raised to protect the low-lying district eastwards of the wolds from the ravages of the sea. These sandhills, upon which most of my collecting took place, are covered with scrub, consisting chiefly of sea-buckthorn, dwarf elder, whitethorn, bramble, and similar